

July 25, 1967

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

Please forgive this letter following so fast on the last one. As you know I do not expect an answer unless you think one appropriate. I have read Photographic Whitewash. (Thank you for your kind mention of me.) As with all your books, each chapter is a revelation and carries to the reader that sense of shock that is at once pleasant and unpleasant; it is sickening to learn that the whitewash has been so blatant and wide; but it is exciting and redeeming to know that the truth is going to be known. You may remember I once believed that Nothing Would Ever Be Done. I now think, thanks largely to your work, the whole story will one day be told. And I have hope that it will be in our lifetime. A second factor contributes to my optimism. I experienced a cold fury when CBS pushed its four hours of propaganda. ~~I stared~~ I stared at Cronkite and Seavard and swore that I would never give up. Therefore, in spite of the fact that I know you do not agree with my reconstruction of the mechanics of the assassination, I have continued to send you material, one, because you requested it, and two, because I am still convinced that I am turning up a fresh perspective. If, for instance, the photos and X rays are ever viewed by an impartial body and it does turn out that they by and large resemble the Commission's case; if for instance, the Garrison case for snipers on the knoll should fail to be established, I will still have provided a coherent and thorough explanation of what could have happened. I think it is what must have happened, simply because I am a reasonable person (Phi Beta Kappa, Mo., 1950) and my reason leads me to the same answer from every direction in which I approach the mechanics of the assassination.

In the attached paper, I present nothing new but perspective. But I do think that my chain of reasoning hold together very tightly. It concerns the false Oswald. I accept that on the basis of what we do know that there was a false Oswald and that is the subject of the paper. But I think it ought to be kept in mind that Oswald was in a sense his own false Oswald: in Russia, in New Orleans in the organization of the FPCC. And that the theory of the false Oswald is somewhat dependent on the veracity of Ruth Paine and the timeclock at the TSBD. Sometimes I doubt Mrs. Paine very much. And anybody can punch you in on a time clock.

Before going on to the false Oswald I would like to offer a thought on the Lovelady caper. I do think it is Oswald in the doorway. Certainly any reasonable person ought to go on the possibility that it could be him. But what about Lovelady? Why would Lovelady say it is himself? FBI armtwisting is one answer, of course. But Lovelady must have been very stubborn in one respect: he absolutely refused to pose in a shirt that could be mistaken for the one worn by "him" in the picture. He must have been shown the picture, have identified himself and then gone and got a shirt. If he had forgotten what he wore that day, he would look among his shirts for one that resembled the picture he had looked at and identified. If he wasn't sure then he would have picked one resembling it, going on the theory that that was probably it. He would have picked a darker long sleeved shirt. Instead he picked a short

sleeved shirt that couldn't possibly be the right one. This discloses a great deal of craftiness on his part, at the least. On the one hand he admits it is a picture of him. On the other hand he poses in a shirt that proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that it isn't him - if that was the shirt he wore that day. What can explain this? Lovelady obviously wanted an out. He had to say that it was he in the picture because that is what the FBI wanted. Yet he left himself an opening. He proved to everyone that it wasn't he. This can ~~only~~ mean two things: one, either he knows perfectly well that it is Oswald and fears it may be proved sometime; or he knows it is himself and that the person was up to something: as I have suggested there is an object in front of the person's chin and shoulder. Whatever that is out in the air is in front of the person, since it cuts off the chin and shoulder. And there is a third possibility, of course. It is Oswald and one of the other men who are obviously up to some shenanigans in front of Oswald is Lovelady. In any case it would seem obvious that Lovelady has some guilty knowledge, the most innocent being that he swore it was himself when he knew it was Oswald. That is the minimum that can be inferred from his refusal to put on a shirt that would condemn him to being the person in the doorway. He did not want to prove that it was himself in the doorway. He wanted for some reason to prove that it was not. Which he did by putting on a shortsleeved, striped shirt. At any rate, something was going on in that doorway and Lovelady knew it.

In my opinion if it was Oswald in the doorway, then the men in the doorway - Shelley, Lovelady, Frazier must have some guilty knowledge, the minimum being that they have lied and condemned a man. And who is the colored man in the niche in front of Oswald? Oswald's left arm is out in the air over his shoulder (if it is not in the air then it is cozily on his shoulder) - surely he must have known if Oswald was standing there with his arm so sweetly on his neck? However the arm is out in the air. And it is moving.

I want to draw your attention to one more thing: in the Altgens photograph there is a man standing on the curb in the far right top end of the picture who is obviously looking up into the air openmouthed, and seems in fact to be pointing out something to a woman standing in front of him with her back to the camera. This man is not looking up at the sixth floor. He is looking into the air over the Vice President's car - about the level of the second or third floor, no higher. He has either seen something happen in the air over the VP car; or in a lower window of the TSBD. And it is startling enough to cause his mouth to drop open and to cause him to lift his right arm and call the woman's attention to it. Also one of the women in the Dal-Tex window just to the right of the projecting arm or object, is looking into the air at about the same position. What have they seen happen in the air? Additionally, a woman on the second floor of the TSBD said the second floor windows shook. I suggest that this could very well mean that a large "torpedo" exploded in the air in front of those windows.

Some other peculiarities in the Altgens photograph are to be found in the vicinity of Hargis. Was the man wearing black gloves. His right hand never shows in the Z film frames. That of Martin riding beside him shows throughout. Hargis is involved in some kind of movement for the white spots representing badges and bars on his chest come and go. Those on Martin's chest remain constant throughout the Z frames. In the Altgens photograph we can easily find Martins hands. They are in a normal position on the handlegrips. We can find neither of Hargis' hands. That which appears to be his right hand

is the grillwork on the Johnson limosine as you can see by studying it and comparing it to the grillwork on the Kennedy car. The left hand may be in the shadows below the gearshift on the handgrip. The right hand should appear just behind that black blob, which is peculiar to the Hargis cycle. It does not appear on any other cycle. Either Hargis had a black or dark circular object way off to the right of his headlights or a black blob of paint has been placed on the photograph there. I cannot find a photograph of Hargis in which I can determine whether he was wearing black gloves or whether he did actually have an anomolous round black object attached to his cycle which the others did not have.

I am unlucky enough to have a very clear light copy of the Dec. 14, 1963 Post. I also have a copy of the issue which contains a much darker print. Nothing can be made from the latter. From the light clear copy much can be made. But in both copies there appears the circular smear in the front of Hargis' windshield, about the size of a thumbprint. The interesting thing about this is that when magnified this smear discloses several scratches and pinholes that cannot have been on the windshield since if magnified to life size the scratches would be an inch thick and the pinholes the size of bullet holes. These defacing marks definitely appear to be on the negative. I wish you would look at this.

And while you are looking, please study the white lines visible through the portion of the windshield on the right side (to Hargis). There are two fingersized white lines with a black mark between them. These appear differently in different prints. In my light clear print they appear to be a forefinger and a middle finger. In fact in my clear copy you can see much else, or think you can. At any rate the black blob conceals what ought to show the right handlegrip and I believe it was empty.

In Yarborough A I had noticed its defacement - those long smear lines through it. You have determined that this was the screen. It is interesting to me that these lines of defacement pass through the cyclist on the ~~left~~ right (to the President) obscuring his face (as his name has been obscured) passing on up to obscure the events in the doorway just below Oswald. On the left (to the President) a long line passes through the face of the man looking into the air, obscuring what he is doing. And Hargis is flooded with a great light coming down from above which does not occur in the original at all. This is another of those amazing coincidences. It is just exactly what I am interested in in the photograph that is obscured by the screen in Yarborough A.

You have proved that the powers that be were desperately afraid of photographic evidence. I merely submit that it could be what I am interested in that they wanted to ~~represent~~ suppress. Especially since they suppressed the fourth rider also. The fact that Featherstone descended so fast on Mrs. Moorman (and didn't Jean Hill say that Featherstone turned out to be a cop?) might indicate that the assassins had planned on the possibility that they might be photographed and were prepared to grab the film? In which case they would also have taken pains to concoct an assassination that would reveal the minimum on film. They would have known in advance that many cameras would be in evidence. I think they were counting on a trick assassination to escape the camera. Which it did. Almost.

Beverly Brunson
Beverly Brunson
Box 296

Baxter Springs, Kansas 66713